



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,812	06/23/2003	Bruce Daniel MacMillan	030167	9837
45695 7590 08/10/2007 WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH P. O. BOX 71355 MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355			EXAMINER ROSE, HELENE ROBERTA	
			ART UNIT 2163	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

80

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/601,812	MACMILLAN, BRUCE DANIEL	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Helene Rose	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 8-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 8-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 6/23/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**Detailed Action**

**Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/10/2007 has been entered.
2. Claims 4-7 are cancelled. Claims 1,17, and 20 have been amended. No claims have been added. Therefore, Claims 1-4 and 8-20 are presently pending examination.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. **Claim 1-3, 8 and 12-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desai et al (US. 6,820,204, Date Filed: March 31, 2000, hereinafter Desai) in view of Matsuo (USPN. 2003/0130857, Date Filed: January 4, 2002) and further in view of Hill et al. (US. 6,029,192, Date of Patent: Feb. 22, 2000, hereinafter Hill).**

**Claim 1:**

Regarding to independent claim 1, Desai teaches a method for **receiving** information in a private database, the method comprising:

at an e-mail server (Figure 1, diagram 30, Desai),  
receiving a request from a wireless communication device to **retrieve** the information in the private database (column 3, lines 49-55, wherein a network device may be any device that is adapted to communicate with the information exchange system via network, which may include a wireless protocol telephone (WAP), or a personal digital assistant (PDA), and column 22, lines 15-19, wherein the information view request subsystem manages request to access a profile information view including accepting or denying information requested by the user of other members, Desai);

Desai does not teach: upon receiving the request, comparing an email address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then authorizing **retrieval from** the private database.

Desai does not teach: sending a query to retrieve the information

On the other hand, Matsuo does teach: upon receiving the request, comparing an email address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then authorizing **retrieval from** the private database (paragraphs [0008] and [0009], wherein this reads over “an intermediary email address is created for a user to which an email message addressed to the intermediary email address may be transmitted via a network and the information about one or more authorized parties associated with the user is received via the network and the information about one or more authorized parties includes an email address associated with each the one or more authorized parties and the information relating to the intermediary email address and the

information about the one or more third parties are stored in a database and paragraph [0009], wherein a record of each received email addressed to the intermediary email address of the user may be stored in a log in the database, the user may be permitted to access the log via the network to review the record stored, Matsuo);

sending a query to retrieve the information (column 10, lines 27-29, wherein when a registered user request profile data the profile data is automatically retrieved from the appropriate location and made available to the register user and column 14, lines 62-67 and column 15, lines 1-25, respectively, Matsuo)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Matsuo teachings into Desai system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggest by Matsuo [paragraph [0008], wherein the sender email address is compared with email addresses of the authorized parties associated with the user stored in the database and if the sender email address is determined to match one of the email addresses of the authorized parties associated with the user stored in the database, then the received email is forwarded via the network to the forwarding email address of the user] for establishing a secure communication exchange utilizing an authentication module to manage access rights of users who are enabled, according to an identifier, in this case, its an email address, for allowing them to view personal content of another user.

However, the combination of Desai and Matsuo do teach: receiving a response to the query, wherein the response includes information (Figure 8, diagrams 804 and 806, Matsuo and column 27, lines 36-53, respectively, Desai). But, Desai and Matsuo do not teach, “wherein the information comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance”.

However Hill teaches: “wherein the information comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance” (column 11, line 15, Hill).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Hill teachings Desai and Matsuo system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggest by Hill [column 2, lines 16-30, respectively] for establishing an improved method for providing an efficient way to retrieve and access data while increasing the overall performance of the system in the process.

sending the information to the wireless communication device (paragraph [0005], wherein at least one of the users may receive the meeting identifier using a wireless device and paragraph [0052], wherein the meeting identifier is transmitted via a network to the network address of the users invited to the meeting in operation, Matsuo); and

if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then denying the request to retrieve the information in the private database (paragraphs [0009] and [0046], respectively, Matsuo).

Claim 2:

Regarding to dependent claim 2, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 1. In addition, the combination of Desai and Matsuo and further in view of Hill teaches wherein receiving the request includes receiving an e-mail from the wireless communication device (Figure 10, all features, wherein this illustrates a process for exchanging email communication utilizing a personal information exchange framework, and paragraph [0039], respectively, Matsuo).

Claim 3:

Regarding to dependent Claim 3, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 2. In addition, the combination of Desai and Matsuo and further in view of Hill teaches

Art Unit: 2163

wherein receiving the email from the wireless communication device includes receiving the email from one of a wireless telephone, a wireless pager and a wireless personal digital assistant (column 3, lines 49-55, Desai).

Claim 8:

Regarding to dependent claim 8, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 2. In addition, the combination of Desai and Matsuo and further in view of Hill teaches wherein sending the query includes identifying text in the e-mail (Figure 4, diagram 420, respectively, Hill).

Claims 12 and 13:

Regarding dependent claims 12 and 13, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 8. In addition, Desai and Matsuo and further in view of Hill teaches wherein identifying text in the e-mail includes identifying a letter (column 7, lines 50-55, wherein this reads over "a letters of strings can be uppercase, lowercase, or a mixture, Hill)

Claim 14:

Regarding dependent claim 14, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 1. In addition, the combination of Desai and Matsuo and further in view of Hill teaches wherein receiving the response includes receiving the information (Refer to claim 1, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same rationale, Desai and Matsuo).

Claim 15:

Regarding to dependent claim 15, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 1. In addition, the combination of Desai and Matsuo and further in view of Hill teaches

wherein sending the information to the wireless communication device includes sending an e-mail to the wireless communication device (paragraph [0008], wherein an email addressed to the intermediary email address of the user is subsequently received via the network, and the received email has a sender email address which identifies the email address of the sender, Matsuo).

Claim 16:

Regarding dependent Claim 16, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 1. In addition, the combination of Desai and Matsuo and further in view of Hill teaches a method further comprising: at the e-mail server, receiving a second request from the wireless communication device, wherein the second request is for **retrieving** additional information; sending a second query, wherein the second query is for retrieving the additional information; receiving a response to the second query, wherein the response to the second query includes the additional information; and sending the additional information to the wireless communication.

**Claim 16, have similar limitations to Claim 1, Therefore, Claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale as Claim 1.**

Claim 17:

Regarding independent claim 17, BRECK teaches an apparatus for **retrieving** information in a private database, the apparatus comprising:

an e-mail server for accessing the private database wherein the e-mail server is configured for communication with a wireless communication device (column 3, lines 49-55, wherein a network device may be any device that is adapted to communicate with the information exchange system via network, which may include a wireless protocol telephone (WAP), or a personal digital assistant (PDA), and column 22, lines 15-19, wherein the



Art Unit: 2163

information view request subsystem manages request to access a profile information view including accepting or denying information requested by the user of other members, Desai) and includes:

Desai does not teach: an identification module for identifying an e-mail address of the wireless communication device.

Desai does not teach: an authorization module for authorizing the e-mail server to **retrieve the information from** the private database and forward the information to the wireless communication device, wherein the authorization module is operative to compare the e-mail addresses identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then authorizing **retrieval from** the private database, and if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then denying the request to **retrieve** the information in the private database.

On the other hand, Matsuo teaches: an identification module for identifying an e-mail address of the wireless communication device (Figure 10, diagram 10008, Matsuo); and

an authorization module for authorizing the e-mail server to **retrieve the information from** the private database and forward the information to the wireless communication device (paragraph [0008], Matsuo), wherein the authorization module is operative to compare the e-mail addresses identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then authorizing **retrieval from** the private database, and if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then denying the request to **retrieve** the information in the private database (paragraph [0008] and [0009], respectively, Matsuo),

Art Unit: 2163

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Matsuo teachings into Desai system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggest by Matsuo [paragraph [0008], wherein the sender email address is compared with email addresses of the authorized parties associated with the user stored in the database and if the sender email address is determined to match one of the email addresses of the authorized parties associated with the user stored in the database, then the received email is forwarded via the network to the forwarding email address of the user] for establishing a secure communication exchange utilizing an authentication module to manage access rights of users who are enabled, according to an identifier, in this case, its an email address, for allowing them to view personal content of another user.

However, the combination of Desai and Matsuo do teach: receiving a response to the query, wherein the response includes information (Figure 8, diagrams 804 and 806, Matsuo and column 27, lines 36-53, respectively, Desai). But, Desai and Matsuo do not disclose, “wherein the information comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance”.

However Hill teaches: “wherein the information comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance” (column 11, line 15, Hill);

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Hill teachings Desai and Matsuo system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggest by Hill [column 2, lines 16-30, respectively] for establishing an improved method for providing an efficient way to retrieve and access data while increasing the overall performance of the system in the process.

Claim 18:

Regarding dependent claim 18, most of the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection to claim 17. In addition the combination of Desai and Matuso and Hill teaches wherein e-mail server comprises a portion of an Intranet (paragraph [0114], respectively, Matsuo).

Claim 19:

Regarding dependent claim 19, most of the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection to claim 17. In addition the combination of Desai and Matuso and Hill teaches wherein the e-mail server comprises a portion of an Extranet (paragraph [0114], Matsuo).

5. **Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo in view of Hill et al. (US. 6,029,192, Date of Patent: Feb. 22, 2000).**

Claim 20:

Regarding independent claim 20, Matsuo teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a set of instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to:

identify an e-mail address of a wireless communication device (Figure 10, diagram 10008, Matsuo); and

authorize an e-mail server to **retrieve** information in a private database and forward the information to the wireless communication device, wherein the processor, in authorizing an e-mail server to **retrieve** information in the private database is operative to compare the e-mail address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then authorizing **retrieval from** the private database, and if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then

Art Unit: 2163

denying the request to access the information in the private database(paragraph [0008] - [0009] and [0046], respectively Matsuo) ,

Matsuo does not teach, “wherein the information comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance”.

On the other hand, Hill teaches, “wherein the information comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance” (column 11, line 15, Hill).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Matsuo teachings Hill system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggest by Hill [column 2, lines 16-30, respectively] for establishing an improved method for providing an efficient way to retrieve and access data while increasing the overall performance of the system in the process.

6. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of BIRRELL et al (US Patent No. 6,185,551, Date of Patent: Feb. 6, 2001, hereinafter Birrell).

Claim 9:

Regarding dependent claim 9, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 8. However, Hill does not teach wherein "identifying wherein text in the email includes identifying a word associated with the information".

On the other hand, BIRRELL teaches wherein, "identifying text in the e-mail includes identifying a word associated with the information" (Column 7, Lines 23-30, Birrell).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Hill system in view of Birrell for "identifying a word associated with the information". A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggest by Birrell for establishing an improved method that will provide faster retrieval of data by allowing a user to easily retrieve messages related to a particular subject/word to improve the overall performance of the system.

Claim 10:

Regarding dependent claim 10, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 9. In addition, the combination of Hill and Birrell teaches wherein identifying the word in the e-mail includes identifying an acronym associated with the information (column 7, lines 39-45, wherein EOM is defined and Figure 5, diagram 530 and diagram 550, Birrell).

Art Unit: 2163

Claim 11:

Regarding dependent claim 11, most of the limitations have been noted in the rejection to claim 8. In addition, the combination of Hill and Birrell teaches wherein identifying text in the e-mail includes identifying a phrase associated with the information (Column 5, Lines 51-57, Birrell)

**Response to Applicant Arguments**

Applicant's arguments filed with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been considered but are moot in view of applicant's amended claims necessitate new ground(s) of rejection.

**Prior Art of Record**

(The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure)

1. Breck (US Publication No. 2003/0131063)
2. Birrell (US Patent No. 6,185,551)
3. Matsuo (USPN. 2003/0130857)
4. Desai et al. (USPN. 6,820,204)
5. Hill et al. (USPN. 6,029,192)


**Point of Contact**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helene R. Rose whose telephone number is (571) 272-0749. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HRR  
Technology Center 2100  
July 26, 2007

  
Hong Vy  
For SPE DON WONG